

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-31 are currently pending; Claims 32-37 having been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 10-31 having been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed claims and specification.

In the outstanding Final Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-20, and 23-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0087892) in view of Ogai (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0177073) in view of Aboulhosn et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0068524, hereafter “Aboulhosn”) and further in view of Brickell et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0115142, hereafter “Brickell”); Claims 9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn, Ogai, and Brickell as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Oho et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184515, hereafter “Oho”); and Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn, Ogai, and Brickell as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Bradee (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0095571) and Satyavolu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0191964, hereafter “Satyavolu”).

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants’ Representative, Monica S. Ullagaddi, on July 6, 2011. During the interview, the differences between Applicants’ invention and the applied art were discussed. Further, proposed claim amendments, similar to those presented herein, were also discussed. The Examiner indicated that the proposed claim amendments appear to overcome the applied art. Arguments and claims similar to those discussed during the interview are presented herewith for formal consideration.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to Claim 1 overcome this ground of rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

subsequently transmitting, from the first service utilizing apparatus, a first apparatus name of the first service utilizing apparatus to the management apparatus, ***the first apparatus name being entered by a user of the first service utilizing apparatus and is selected independently of any apparatus names entered for the second apparatus such that the first apparatus name entered by the user of the first service utilizing apparatus is the same as an apparatus name entered for the second apparatus;*** [and]

transmitting, from the first service utilizing apparatus to the management apparatus, disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the existence of the first service utilizing apparatus registered in the management apparatus is to be disclosed to other users.

Turning now to the references, the Examiner newly sets forth Ogai as teaching “subsequently transmitting, from the first service utilizing apparatus, a first apparatus name of the first service utilizing apparatus to the management apparatus...,” as recited in Claim 1. In this regard, Ogai describes a server apparatus operating a content sale site for selling digital content via a communication network. *See, e.g.*, the Abstract of Ogai. The Examiner asserts paragraphs [0042], [0045], [0061], and [0073] of Ogai as teaching the above-noted features of Applicants’ independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Ogai merely discloses that electronic music apparatuses each have a unique electronic music apparatus ID (*i.e.*, a machine ID) and is given a nickname by its user. Ogai further discloses displaying together apparatus numbers and nicknames, that are registered at a content sale site 1. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Ogai does not disclose “subsequently transmitting, from the first service utilizing apparatus, a first apparatus name of the first

service utilizing apparatus to the management apparatus, the first apparatus name being entered by a user of the first service utilizing apparatus and is selected independently of any apparatus names entered for the second apparatus such that ***the first apparatus name entered by the user of the first service utilizing apparatus is the same as an apparatus name entered for the second apparatus,***” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Imazu, Aboulhosn, and Brickell fail to cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Ogai.

Turning now to Aboulhosn, the cited portions of Aboulhosn are submitted to disclose that a file sharing system may have a server (e.g., an authorization server) that controls whether a member is currently online or offline. As previously discussed, the cited portion of Aboulhosn discloses that a group owner sends an invitation message and if the invitation is accepted, the group owner adds the new member to its list of members for that group. See, e.g., paragraph [0016] of Aboulhosn. However, the cited portion of Aboulhosn does not disclose that a user provides a setting to management apparatus which indicates whether ***the existence of a device owned by the user is to be disclosed to other users***. Rather, Aboulhosn merely describes a new member joining a group which has existing members. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Aboulhosn fails to disclose or render obvious “transmitting, to the management apparatus, disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the first apparatus names of the first service utilizing apparatus registered in the management apparatus are to be published to the management apparatus,” as recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Imazu, Ogai, and Brickell fail to cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Aboulhosn.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Imazu, Aboulhosn, Ogai and Brickell either alone or in proper combination.

Oho, Bradee, and Satyavolu have been considered but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Imazu, Aboulhosn, Ogai, and Brickell with regard to amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Imazu, Aboulhosn, Ogai, Brickell, Oho, Bradee, and Satyavolu, either alone or in proper combination.

Amended independent Claims 10-12, 23, and 24 recite features similar to those of amended Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 10-12, 23 and 24 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over Imazu, Aboulhosn, Ogai, Brickell, Oho, Bradee, and Satyavolu, either alone or in proper combination.

With regard to Claim 18, the Examiner sets forth paragraph [0013] of Aboulhosn as teaching the claimed combination of features. In this regard, Aboulhosn is submitted to disclose that when a member accesses a virtual file, a file sharing system detects the access and requests that the file owner provide a copy of the file to the accessing member on a peer-to-peer basis. At most, Aboulhosn describes metadata identifying the file name, file owner, creation date, and last modification date. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0014] of Aboulhosn. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Aboulhosn, either alone or in any proper combination (with Imazu, Ogai, Brickell, Oho, Bradee, and Satyavolu), fails to disclose or render obvious at least “receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the first service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester of predetermined contents data and comprising *the apparatus name of the first service utilizing apparatus*, contents identification information about the contents data, *and the second apparatus name of the second service utilizing apparatus* which is a provider of the contents data[,], and transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the second service utilizing apparatus,” as recited in Claim 18.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. J. S. 200', is written over a horizontal line.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Monica S. Ullagaddi
Registration No. 63,823

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)